

Report of the Accreditation Visit to the San Joaquin County Office of Education (Project Impact) District Internship Program

Professional Services Division

January 6, 2003

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at the San Joaquin County Office of Education. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the agency.

The program that was the subject of this accreditation review is called Project Impact, is a Multiple and Single Subject District Intern Program. The program is a consortium of more than thirty districts coordinated and administered through the San Joaquin County Office of Education. The processes and procedures that were used are the same as those used for university-based programs. Preconditions that are specific to District Intern programs were used since District Intern programs have specific statutory requirements, which are different than university-based programs. This program was approved based SB 2042 Standards and Preconditions.

Accreditation Recommendations

- The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for the San Joaquin County Office of Education (Project Impact) District Internship Programs:

ACCREDITATION.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Multiple Subject

Single Subject

- Staff recommends that:
 - The agency's response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - San Joaquin County Office of Education (Project Impact) District Internship Program be permitted to propose new district internship credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.

- San Joaquin County Office of Education (Project Impact) District Internship Program be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2007-2008 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Background Information

Project Impact is a District Internship program organized by the San Joaquin County Office of Education. The program is a consortium of more than thirty districts in eight counties. Partners include school districts within Amador, Calaveras, Contra Costa, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare Counties. In 2002-03 Project Impact has 325 teachers serving on district intern certificates; 138 are continuing in their second year of the program and 187 are in their first year. The program offers instruction for both multiple and single subject candidates. Since 1997-98, 129 have been recommended for credentials by the governing boards of their respective school districts. Only two of these former district interns are no longer teaching.

The program is supported by three sources of funds: intern fees, alternative certification grant funds, and district and county office in-kind support, particularly for peer coach stipends and release time for support/coaching activities. Project Impact also offers a full continuum of services by providing assistance through the Pre-intern program for those who have not completed subject matter requirements, and also provides Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment services. Project Impact was one of the first programs to be approved based on the new SB 2042 Standards as an early adopter.

A variety of learning resources are available to interns including drop-in computers with internet access and printers, teacher resource books in all subject areas and grades and current educational journals. Also available to interns who have completed the Level II technology training are digital cameras, digital video equipment and other electronic educational aides. These are particularly useful to support candidates in gathering evidence for their portfolios and in preparing for the Graduation Exhibition.

The instructional program provides modules and ongoing practicum seminars in the areas listed below. The program begins with a 120 clock hour Introduction to Teaching. Over the next two years district interns receive instruction through a format that offers two courses each week for three hours each. Most courses are completed in six weeks. The total number of clock hours in instruction and support seminars in the programs is more than 500. In many of the areas of instruction, concepts are introduced in the preservice program and then returned to with increasing complexity in the first and second years of the program.

Preservice

Introduction to Teaching

Teachers as Learners

Thinking and Learning

Creating a Learning Community

Understanding Assessment

Thinking about Planning

Technology in the Classroom

Year 1 and 2-Multiple Subject

Curriculum and Instruction in Science
Mathematics Curriculum and Instruction for Elementary Grades
Curriculum and Instruction in History and Social Science
Curriculum and Instruction in the Visual and Performing Arts
Curriculum and Instruction in Health and Safety
Curriculum and Instruction in Physical Education
Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students
Instructional Strategies for English Language Learners
Exceptional Learners I: Differentiation in the Classroom
Exceptional Learners II: Special Education Students in the Classroom
Beginning Reading
Classroom Management and Discipline
History and Philosophy of Education
Building Academic Language
Curriculum and Methods in Literature and Writing
Technology in the Classroom-Level Two
Psycho-Social and Cognitive Development of Children

Practicum

Year Two Seminar

Graduation Seminar

The three types of support seminars listed above provide opportunities to discuss classroom situations, develop best practices, and share ideas with peers and to receive formative and summative feedback from practicum supervisors. Intern also practice Teaching Performance Assessment tasks. In the Graduation Seminar candidates work collaboratively with peers and the course instructor as they develop a multi-media presentation, which exhibits how they have met all California Standards for the Teaching Profession. This presentation is presented to a review panel as a culmination event of the two years in Project Impact.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the school district program in 1999 and met with the program's leadership on several occasions about the accreditation visit. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. The size of the team was determined in the Fall of 2001. The Administrator for Accreditation and the Staff Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*. In addition, telephone and regular personal communication was maintained between the staff consultant and project representatives.

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared based on the SB 2042 Standards approved by the Commission.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Tuesday November 11, 2002. The team arrived on Monday afternoon and began with a meeting of the team. On Tuesday and Wednesday November 12 and 13, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*.

A total of 279 group and individual interviews were conducted by the team members in the two days devoted to collection of data. Lunch on Tuesday and Wednesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The team met on Tuesday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. Wednesday evening and Thursday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the report.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each Standard, the team made a decision of "Standard Met," "Met Minimally" with Concerns or "Standard Not Met." The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

The team discussed an initial draft of the report on Wednesday evening. After the report was finished, the team met Wednesday morning for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit.

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that all standards were met except for one Common Standard and one element for each of two Program Standards, which were minimally met. The team then considered the appropriate accreditation decision for the institution. The team weighed its concerns about these standards with the overall quality of the program. The options were: "Accreditation," "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations," "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations," "Accreditation with Probationary Stipulations" or "Denial of Accreditation." After thorough discussion, the team decided to recommend the status of "**Accreditation.**"

**COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: San Joaquin County Office of Education

Program: Project IMPACT
District Intern Program
Multiple and Single Subject Credential Program

Dates of Visit: November 12-14, 2002

Cluster Leader: Brenda Fikes
San Jose State University

Cluster Member: Helene T. Mandell
CSU, CalStateTEACH

Cluster Member: Lucy Vezzuto
Orange County of Department of Education

Cluster Member: J. Thomas Williams
Moreno Valley Unified School District

ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATION: Accreditation

RATIONALE

The unanimous recommendation for accreditation by the team, is based upon a thorough review of the self study documentation, additional information in the form of exhibits, and extensive interviews with program leadership, consortium partners, faculty, practicum supervisors, site support personnel, candidates and graduates. Based upon the evidence obtained, the team finds that seven of the eight Common Standards are fully met and seventeen of the nineteen Program Standards are fully met. One of the Common Standards and two elements of the nineteen Program Standards, all pertaining to the same issue, are met with concerns. However, the overall quality of the program more than compensates for these concerns.

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
57	Program Faculty		Catalog
13	Institutional Administration	x	Institutional Self Study
94	Candidates	x	Course Syllabi
51	Graduates	x	Candidate Files
13	Employers of Graduates	x	Program Handbook
13	Peer Coaches	x	Follow-up Survey Results
1	Advisors		Needs Analysis Results
12	School Administrators	x	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst		Field Experience Notebook
15	Advisory Committee	x	Schedule of Classes
5	External Evaluators	x	Advisement Documents
5	Visiting Educators	x	Faculty Vitae
			Other (Name)

COMMON STANDARDS

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that the all common standards are fully met except Common Standard 8, Field Supervision, which is met with concerns.

Standard 1 - Educational Leadership

Standard Met

Project IMPACT is a district intern program sponsored by a consortium of local school districts and coordinated by the San Joaquin County Office of Education (SJCOE). The Program Leadership Team consists of the Director of Teacher Development, Assistant Director/Pre-Intern Coordinator, and the Manager of Admissions and Student Services. The key policy-making body, the Consortium Leadership Team, is comprised of the Program Leadership Team and representatives from each of the 30+ school districts in the consortium. Many examples of policy decisions made by the Consortium Leadership Team were presented to the team, resulting in a high level of satisfaction noted by its members.

Strengths

Program candidates, graduates, faculty, practicum supervisors and district partners praised the program leadership, specifically the Director of Teacher Development. Evidence was consistently presented citing her being “on the cutting edge” with respect to the changing state requirements as well as her responsiveness to stakeholders.

Concerns

None noted

Standard 2 - Resources

Standard Met

The team found overwhelming evidence indicating that human and fiscal resources allocated to the program were more than adequate. The team was impressed with the SJCOE’s support for the program classrooms, technology lab, and professional library. Moreover, all team members interviewed faculty and supervisors who noted the considerable professional development opportunities offered to faculty and practicum supervisors, including well-attended semi-annual faculty retreats. In the single subject program, evidence was presented that even low-incidence content areas would have separate courses in subject-specific pedagogy.

Strengths

The team commends the program for allocating substantial resources for professional development opportunities

Concerns

None noted

Standard 3 - Faculty**Standard Met**

Evidence was presented to the team that the program faculty are qualified for and extremely knowledgeable about the courses they teach. Candidates repeatedly noted their appreciation that all program faculty are current practitioners and present coursework in a practical manner.

Strengths

There was overwhelming evidence that program faculty are extremely responsive to interns' concerns. Both current candidates and program graduates repeatedly noted how accessible program faculty are to respond to many different issues.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 4 - Evaluation**Standard Met**

Project IMPACT employs an external evaluation team to coordinate all aspects of course and program evaluation. Evidence was presented to the team that program evaluation data was regularly collected, organized, analyzed, and interpreted by the external evaluation team and reported to program leadership and faculty on a regular basis. Many examples of program improvement as a result of data collected were presented to team members. One noteworthy example frequently cited in interviews from many stakeholders, was the establishment of the regular Cohort Team Meetings, whereby interns, faculty and practicum supervisors from a particular cohort have opportunity to articulate content across the program.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 5 - Admissions**Standard Met**

Evidence presented to the team indicated that the admissions process went quite smoothly for program candidates. The Credential Analyst and Admissions and Student Services Manager continually collaborate to ensure candidates receive accurate and timely information. There is a clear set of procedures for admissions and exit from the program and candidates indicated they were well informed. Additionally, candidates reported a smooth transition from Pre—Intern to Intern, when filing requisite paperwork.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance**Standard Met**

Notwithstanding the changing state credentialing requirements, most program candidates reported that they receive accurate and timely advice. The credential analyst reported that she consistently files all required certification documents in collaboration with school district credential technicians. In addition, program candidates and graduates reported that program advisors often adapt their schedules to meet interns' needs. There was documented evidence of delineated processes and procedures for formative assessment of candidate competence prior to advancement in the program. Additionally, processes and procedures are in place to identify candidates' areas of need and determine corrective action.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 7 - School Collaboration**Standard Met**

Project IMPACT collaborates with its school district partners in significant ways. Through program documentation and stakeholder interviews, team members found this collaboration to be clearly a part of the culture of the program. There is genuine and frequent interaction in nearly all aspects of program implementation. The program's key policymaking body is comprised of school district representatives who reported their participation in major program decisions.

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

None noted.

Standard 8 - Field Supervision**Standard Met with Concerns**

The team found much evidence of inconsistencies in the use of district-employed peer coaches. Several areas were noted as being inconsistent, including:

- Lack of peer coaches for some interns
- Appropriate matching of intern and peer coach relative to grade level(MS) and/or subject matter expertise(SS)
- Differing selection processes from district to district
- "Mandatory" peer coaching training not attended by all peer coaches
- Lack of compensation for some peer coaches

Strengths

None noted.

Concerns

Noted above.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Multiple Subject Credential and Single Subject Credential

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, intern teachers, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that the all program standards are fully met for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs except Standard 2, Required Element b, Collaboration in Governing the Program, and Standard 16, Required Element c, Qualifications of Fieldwork Supervisors, which are met with concerns.

Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program

Standard Met with Concerns

Element B. As noted in Common Standard 8, there was evidence indicating that some school districts do not completely fulfill their agreements to provide peer coaches. Interviews with candidates and graduates substantiated this finding.

Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications of Field Supervisors –

Standard Met with Concerns

Element C. Although the program has increased the practicum supervisors' hours to compensate for the unevenness of the peer coach support, evidence was presented to the team showing that not all school districts clearly outline and consistently follow criteria and procedures for selection of peer coaches.

All of the remaining programs standards and elements were fully met, including the remaining elements of Standards 2 and 16. The team chose to make individual comments on each program standard, even though not required to.

Category A - Program Design, Governance and Qualities

Standard 1: Program Design

Standard Met

Evidence indicates the program is well designed, reflects principles of teacher development, and includes a purposeful, developmentally designed sequence of coursework and field experiences that effectively prepare candidates to teach all K-12 students.

Standard 3: Relationships Between Theory and Practice

Standard Met

Through coursework, classroom observations, and supervised fieldwork, candidates examine educational theories and research and their relationships to pedagogical strategies and student accomplishments, attitudes, and conduct.

Standard 4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice

Standard Met

Reflective practice is evident throughout the program in coursework, portfolio project, and fieldwork logs. Both interns and graduates commented on the frequent opportunities to share and reflect upon their practices.

Standard 5: Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum

Standard Met

Candidates and graduates consistently reported in interviews their high level of confidence and success in working with a diverse population of students.

Category B – Preparation to Teach Curriculum to All Students in California Schools

Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn, Practice and Reflect on Teaching in All Subject Areas

Standard Met

The program provides multiple opportunities to learn, practice, and reflect on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, as reported by numerous candidates, graduates, faculty, and as indicated in candidate files.

Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts – Multiple and Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English

Standard Met

The reading coursework addresses all the elements of the standard. Candidates reported a high comfort level in the challenges of teaching reading to all students in their classrooms, including English language learners.

Standard 8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction – By Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates

Standard Met

The program leadership shows strong commitment to contributing resources for pedagogical preparation for subject specific content instruction even in those subjects with a low incidence of candidates. There was clear evidence that the faculty have strong passion for their subject and commitment to equipping interns to teach their subjects with confidence.

Standards 9: Using Computer-Based Technology in the Classroom

Standard Met

County and program resources have been effectively used to develop an exemplary technology facility and curriculum. Candidates show confidence in the use of technology in the classroom and in some cases have assumed leadership at their school sites in this area.

Category C – Preparation to Teach All Students in California Schools

Standard 10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive, Healthy Environment for Student Learning **Standard Met**

Candidates reported learning concepts and strategies in classroom management course, which facilitates their implementation of a safe and nurturing learning environment.

Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research **Standard Met**

A variety of educational theories and approaches are presented to candidates providing them with a theoretical and historical framework for effective pedagogical practices, as indicated by course syllabi and interviews.

Standard 12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning and the Teaching Profession **Standard Met**

Professional expectations are woven throughout the coursework and fieldwork. Interviews revealed there is an emphasis on modeling professional behaviors and best practices by instructors and practicum supervisors.

Standard 13: Preparation to Teach English Learners **Standard Met**

Candidates reported that they understand and use instructional practices that promote English language development in English Learners in their classrooms.

Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations in the General Education Classroom **Standard Met**

The faculty has a high level of expertise in all aspects of understanding and modifying curriculum for students with special needs in general education classrooms.

Category D – Supervised Fieldwork in the Program

Standard 15: Learning to Teach Through Supervised Fieldwork **Standard Met**

The majority of candidates and graduates interviewed by the team reported that support received from field supervisors is positive, constructive, and consistent. Supervision is responsive and flexible to individual candidates' needs and circumstances.

Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence **Standard Met**

The program meets all elements of this standard in the admission and prerequisite requirements. Procedures are in place to assess each candidate's qualifications prior to daily teaching responsibilities.

Standard 18: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence **Standard Met**

The program participated in the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) pilot in Spring 2002 and is currently participating in the TPA field review.

Category E – Assessment of Candidates Performance

Standard 19: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence **Standard Met**

Multiple measures are in place for both formative and summative assessments of candidate competence.

Overall Program Strengths

The program is to be commended for:

- Contributing resources for pedagogical preparation for subject specific content instruction even in those subjects with a low incidence of candidates.
- Their technology training and the use of technology in instruction. Candidates reported that their ability to apply their technological knowledge frequently placed them in leadership roles at their school sites.
- An exemplary level of collaboration among instructors, field supervisors, program leadership, and the cohort, which results in a high level of support for the candidates.
- Consistently seeking highly qualified practitioners, who provide candidates with instruction that is current and relevant.
- The responsiveness to all stakeholders' feedback on course content, sequence, and other programmatic issues.

Professional Comments

Commendations

The team found the program to be exemplary in the following areas.

- Meeting intern, district, and community needs
- School district support and satisfaction
- Program cohesiveness
- High level of support for interns
- Effective program evaluation process
- Professional development for faculty
- Cutting edge technology

Recommendations

- The program should explore the viability of expanding the evaluation process for faculty, and consider ways to include multiple evaluative measures, beyond student rating forms.
- Because several syllabi are missing clear course goals and learning outcomes or objectives. Provide faculty assistance to develop comprehensive course syllabi, which clearly delineate goals and learning outcomes and assessments.
- Candidates need to be given accurate information about the transferability of units prior to beginning the program.
- Because all of the stakeholders' responsibilities were not detailed in the letter of agreement develop a detailed Memorandum of Understanding which specifically lists school district and program roles and responsibilities.
- Continue to address single subject candidates' concerns in developing the single subject courses.
- Because some candidates expressed concerns that their respective school districts did not accept the program's professional development credits for placement on the salary schedule, the program leadership should review the requirements of district intern statutes related to this issue with participating districts.